

1 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**

2 **DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

3 **DREW RIBAR,**

4 Plaintiff, Pro Se,

5 v.

6 **WASHOE COUNTY, NEVADA, et al.,**

7 Defendants.

8 Case No. 3:24-cv-00526-ART-CSD

9 **[PROPOSED] ORDER REGARDING DISCOVERY DISPUTE – RECORDING**

10 **DEPOSITIONS**

11 Having considered Plaintiff's Response to Defendants' Motion Regarding Discovery Dispute –
12 Recording Depositions (ECF No. 90), the Court finds that audiovisual recording of depositions
13 by the Plaintiff is permissible under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 30(b)(3)(A), and that
14 Defendants have not met their burden under Rule 26(c) to justify a protective order prohibiting
15 such recording.

16 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:

17 1. Defendants' Motion to Prohibit Audiovisual Recording of Depositions (ECF No. 90) is

18 **DENIED.**

- 1 2. Plaintiff may personally record depositions **audiovisually** using a **tripod-mounted**
2 **camera** in accordance with Fed. R. Civ. P. 30(b)(3)(A) and 30(b)(5). Such recording
3 must be conducted in a **non-disruptive and unobtrusive** manner.
- 4 3. Subject to the **existing protective order** (ECF No. 89), **post-litigation publication** of
5 deposition recordings shall be permitted unless otherwise ordered by the Court based on a
6 showing of specific harm.
- 7 4. The Court clarifies that, for purposes of compliance with Fed. R. Civ. P. 37(a)(1), the
8 **meet-and-confer requirement may be satisfied** through **email, recorded Zoom, or**
9 **similarly documented means**, particularly where justified by pro se status, health
10 conditions, or concerns about accuracy and misrepresentation.
- 11 5. Plaintiff shall continue to comply with all confidentiality, redaction, and technical
12 guidelines previously ordered or otherwise required under the Federal Rules.

16 IT IS SO ORDERED.

18 DATED: _____

21 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

22 CRAIG S. DENNEY

28 PLEADING TITLE - 2